

The Donkey of the Dajjâl

A Detailed Study
of the
Authenticity of
the Narrations on
the Topic

and Refutation of the Idea That They
Refer to The Modern-Day Aeroplane

and the Danger of Interpreting the
Texts of the Sharī'ah
Metaphorically

By
Abû Tâlût Haytham Âl Sayfaddîn

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

In recent years, a trend has developed amongst some *Islâmic* speakers in which they interpret the *Aḥâdîth* referring to the donkey of the *Dajjâl* as being an aeroplane. This is born of and leads to further misconceptions about the reality of the *Dajjâl* itself, and in broader terms, the manner in which the Texts of *Islâm* are to be understood.

They state that there are *Aḥâdîth* which state he will come on a donkey, that the donkey will be enormous, that it has extremely long ears, that it will fly and go from cloud to cloud, nearly be able to touch the clouds and so on.

In these pages, I will discuss the issue in the following points: 1. What weak narrations have come on the topic and what deems them weak? 2. What is confirmed on the topic? 3. How are we to understand what is confirmed?

1. What Are the Weak Narrations on This Topic and What Deems Them Weak?

a) The *Mawqûf Ḥadîth* of ‘Alî Ibn Abî Ṭâlib collected by Ibn al-Munâdî ¹ and Abû ‘Amr ad-Dânî ²

It is reported that ‘Alî Ibn Abî Ṭâlib said:

"أَلَا إِنَّ الدَّجَالَ طُولُهُ أَرْبَعُونَ ذِرَاعًا بِالدِّرَاعِ الْأَوَّلِ. تَحْتَهُ حِمَارٌ أَقَمَرَ طُولُ كُلِّ أُذُنٍ مِنْ أُذُنَيْهِ ثَلَاثُونَ ذِرَاعًا. مَا يَبْنِي حَافِرِ حِمَارِهِ إِلَى الْحَافِرِ الْآخِرِ مَسِيرَةَ يَوْمٍ وَلَيْلَةٍ. تُطَوَّى لَهُ الْأَرْضُ مِنْهُلًا. يَتَنَاوَلُ السَّحَابَ بِيَمِينِهِ..."

"Indeed, the height of the *Dajjâl* is forty cubits, based upon the original cubit. Beneath him is a bright white donkey; the length of each of its ears is thirty cubits. The distance between each of his donkey's hooves is the distance of a day and a night's travel. The ground will be contorted into a watering hole for it. He will touch the clouds with his right hand..."

This is the most detailed and most widely used narration on this topic, so I began with it, even though it is not attributed to the Prophet, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

It was mentioned as a whole by Al-Muttaqî al-Hindî. After mentioning it, Al-Muttaqî al-Hindî said: "Narrated by Ibn al-Munâdî. It contains Ḥammâd Ibn ‘Amr who is *Matrûk* (narrating) from As-Surrî Ibn [Khâlîd]. ³ In ‘*Al-Mîzân*’ he (i.e. Ath-Thahabî) said: ‘He is not known. And Al-Azdî said: He is not to be used as proof.’"

¹ Refer to "*Kanz al-‘Ummâl Fî Sunan al-Aqwâli Wal-A‘mâl*", by Al-Muttaqî al-Hindî, Vol. 14/612.

² "*As-Sunan al-Wâridah Fil-Fitan*", (#664)

³ The name Khâlîd is missing in the source. However, the narrator named As-Surrî whom Ḥammâd Ibn ‘Amr narrates from is As-Surrî Ibn Khâlîd.

It appears what is being referred to here is a *Ḥadīth* narrated by Abul-Ḥusayn Aḥmad Ibn Ja'far Ibn al-Munâdî (d. 336 H.) in his book "*Al-Fitan Wal-Malâḥim*". It is currently only in manuscript form in a library of the *râfidhah*. It was published once with the verification and commentary of a *râfidhî*. However, I do not have access to the published form, so I cannot provide the full chain; only what Al-Muttaqî al-Hindî mentioned. Regardless of the rest of the chain, this *Ḥadīth* is extremely weak and likely fabricated.

It contains two defects that we know of:

1. It contains Ḥammâd Ibn 'Amr an-Naṣībî, who was a liar and fabricator of *Aḥādīth* ⁴

Yaḥyâ Ibn Ma'în (d. 233 H.) said: "He is from amongst those who are known to lie and fabricate *Ḥadīth*."

And he also said: "He is nothing."

And Muḥammad Ibn 'Ammâr al-Mûṣîlî (d. 242 H.) said: "I do not view it permissible to narrate from him. He did not know what *Ḥadīth* were."

And Mujâhid Ibn Mûsâ (d. 244 H.) said: "I abandoned him."

And Al-Bukhârî (d. 256 H.) said: "He is *Munkar* (Objectionable) when it comes to *Ḥadīth*. He was declared weak by 'Alî Ibn Ḥajar."

And Abû Zur'ah ar-Râzî (d. 264 H.) said: "He is extremely *Wâhî* (Feeble) when it comes to *Ḥadīth*."

And he also said: "He is *Munkar* (Objectionable) when it comes to *Ḥadīth*."

And Abu Ḥâtim ar-Râzî (d. 277 H.) said: "He is *Munkar* (Objectionable) when it comes to *Ḥadīth*. He is extremely *Dha'îf* (Weak) when it comes to *Ḥadīth*."

And An-Nasâ'î (d. 303 H.) said: "He is *Matrûk* (Abandoned) when it comes to *Ḥadīth*."

And he also said: "He was not trustworthy."

And Ibn al-Jârûd (d. 307 H.) said: "He is *Munkar* (Objectionable) when it comes to *Ḥadīth*. He is essentially nothing. He does not know what *Ḥadīth* are."

⁴ "Al-Kâmil Fî Dhu'afâ' ar-Rijâl" by Ibn 'Adî, Vol. 3/10, "Adh-Dhu'afâ' Wal-Matrûkîn", by An-Nasâ'î, Vol. 1/234, "Adh-Dhu'afâ' al-Kabîr", by Al-'Uqaylî, Vol. 1/308, "At-Târikh al-Kabîr", Vol. 1/28, "At-Târikh aṣ-Ṣaghîr", Vol. 2/291, and "Adh-Dhu'afâ' aṣ-Ṣaghîr" all by Al-Bukhârî, pg. 35, "Târikh Ibn Ma'în", by Ad-Dârimî, pg. 90, "Ma'rifat ar-Rijâl Lil-Ibn Ma'în", by Ibn Muḥriz, Vol. 1/63-67, "Su'âlât Abî Zur'ah", by Al-Bartha'î, Vol. 2/373, "Aḥwâl ar-Rjâl", by Al-Jawzajânî, pg. 179, "Al-Kunâ Wal-Asmâ'", by Muslim Ibn al-Ḥajjâj, Vol. 1/54, "Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta'dîl", by Ibn Abî Ḥâtim, Vol. 2/144, "Adh-Dhu'afâ'" by Abû Nu'aym", 74, "Al-Majrûḥîn Min al-Muḥaddithîn", by Ibn Hibbân, Vol. 1/252, "Adh-Dhu'afâ' Wal-Matrûkîn", by Ad-Dâraqutnî, 183 and elsewhere.

And Ibn Hibbân (d. 354 H.) said: “He fabricates *Ḥadīth* upon the trustworthy narrators...It is not allowed to write his *Ḥadīth* except as a means of astonishment.”

And Abû ‘Abdillâh *al-Ḥâkim* (d. 405 H.) said: “He narrates fabricated *Aḥādīth* from a group of trustworthy narrators, and he is strongly disreputable.”

2. It contains As-Surrî Ibn Khâlid, who is *Majhûl* (Unknown) ⁵

As mentioned earlier, Ath-Thahabî (d. 748 H.) said: “He is not known.” And he mentioned that Abul-Fat’h al-Azdî (d. 374 H.) said: “He is not to be used as proof.” Furthermore, Ibn Abî Ḥâtim (d. 327 H.) mentioned him in “*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta’dîl*” and did not make any comments about him; positive or negative. And other than this, there is not much about him in the books of “*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta’dîl*”, which supports that fact that he is unknown.

And as mentioned earlier, this narration was also narrated by Abû ‘Amr ad-Dânî. He said:

أَخْبَرَنَا عَبْدُ اللَّهِ بْنُ عَمْرٍو الْمُكْتَبُ قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا عَتَّابُ بْنُ هَارُونَ قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا الْفَضْلُ بْنُ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ الْفَضْلِ قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ الْفَضْلِ الْهَمْدَانِيُّ قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو نَعِيمٍ مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ يَحْيَى الطُّوسِيُّ قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا إِبْرَاهِيمُ بْنُ مُوسَى الْفَرَّاءُ الرَّازِيُّ قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا زَيْدُ بْنُ الْحُبَابِ قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا عِيسَى بْنُ الْأَشْعَثِ عَنْ جُوَيْرٍ عَنِ النَّزَّالِ بْنِ سَبْرَةَ قَالَ: خَطَبَنَا عَلِيُّ بْنُ أَبِي طَالِبٍ...

‘Abdullâh Ibn ‘Amr al-Muktib informed us, saying: ‘Attâb Ibn Hârûn told us, saying: Al-Fadhî Ibn ‘Ubaydillâh Ibn al-Fadhî told us, saying: Muḥammad Ibn al-Fadhî al-Hamdânî told us, saying: Abû Nu’aym Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Yaḥyâ aṭ-Ṭûsî told us, saying: Ibrâhîm Ibn Mûsâ al-Farrâ’ ar-Râzî told us, saying: Zayd Ibn al-Ḥubâb told us, saying: ‘Îsâ Ibn al-Ash’ath told us: On the authority of Juwaybir: On the authority of An-Nazzâl Ibn Sabrah who said: ‘Alî Ibn Ibn Ṭâlib addressed us...

"يُخْرِجُ مِنْ يَهُودِيَّةٍ أَصْبَهَانَ عَلَى حِمَارٍ أَبْتَرَّ مَا بَيْنَ أُذُنَيْ حِمَارِهِ أَرْبَعُونَ ذِرَاعًا مَا بَيْنَ خَافِرِهِ إِلَى الْخَافِرِ الْآخِرِ مَسِيرَةُ أَرْبَعِ لَيَالٍ تَطْوِي لَهُ الْأَرْضَ مِنْهَا مَنْهَلًا يَتَنَاوَلُ السَّمَاءَ بِيَدِهِ..."

“He will emerge from the Jews of Esfahan, on a tailless donkey. Between each of its ears is (the distance of) forty cubits. Between each of its hooves is the distance of four nights’ travel. The ground will be contorted into watering hole after watering hole for it. He will grab the sky with his hand...”

This chain is extremely weak as well.

It contains at least seven defects:

1. It contains ‘Abdullâh Ibn ‘Amr al-Muktib who is *Majhûl* (Unknown). No one wrote a biography on him, and no one mentioned any *Jarḥ* or *Ta’dîl* in his regard. Likewise, only one person narrated from him; Abû ‘Amr ad-Dânî.

⁵ “*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta’dîl*”, by Ibn Abî Ḥâtim, Vol. 2/284 and “*Mizân al-Itidâl*”, by Ath-Thahabî, Vol. 2/117

2. It contains ‘Attâb Ibn Hârûn who is *Majhûl* (Unknown) as well. Only one person narrated from him; ‘Abdullâh Ibn ‘Amr al-Muktib. Likewise, there are no words about him in the books of *Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta’dîl* other than a few mentioning that he was a righteous person.

3. It contains Al-Fadhî Ibn ‘Ubaydillâh Ibn al-Fadhî who is also *Majhul* (Unknown). No one wrote a biography on him, and no one mentioned any *Jarḥ* or *Ta’dîl* in his regard.

4. Abû Nu’aym Muḥammad Ibn Yahyâ aṭ-Ṭûsî is *Majhûl* (Unknown) as well. No one wrote a biography on him, and no one mentioned any *Jarḥ* or *Ta’dîl* in his regard.

5. The *Tafarrud* (Individual Narration) of Abû Nu’aym Muḥammad Ibn Yahyâ aṭ-Ṭûsî from Ibrâhîm Ibn Mûsâ al-Farrâ’ ar-Râzî. This is because over a dozen people narrated from Ibrâhîm Ibn Mûsâ, including major *Imâms* of *Ḥadîth*, such as Al-Bukhârî, Muslim, Abû Dâwûd, Abû Zur’ah ar-Râzî, Abû Ḥâtim ar-Râzî and others. Despite this, the only person we have narrating this from his is an unknown narrator.

6. It contains ‘Îsâ Ibn al-Ash’ath is *Majhûl* (Unknown). ⁶ This was mentioned by Abû Ḥâtim ar-Râzî (d. 277 H.), and is evident due to the lack of information about him in the books of *Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta’dîl*.

7. It contains Juwaybir, whose name is Jâbir Ibn Sa’îd, and he is *Matrûk* (Abandoned). ⁷

‘Abdur-Raḥmân Ibn Mahdî (d. 198 H.) said: “He is not to be narrated from.”

And Yahyâ Ibn Ma’în (d. 233 H.) said: “He is nothing. He is *Dha’îf* (Weak).”

And Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241 H.) said: “Do not busy yourself with his *Ḥadîth*.”

And Abû Zur’ah ar-Râzî (d. 264 H.) and Abû Ḥâtim ar-Râzî (d. 277 H.) both said: “He is not strong.”

And ‘Alî Ibn al-Junayd ar-Râzî (d. 291 H.) and Ad-Dâraqutnî (d. 385 H.) said: “He is *Matrûk* (Abandoned).”

And Şâlih Ibn Muḥammad Jazarah (d. 293 H.) said: “Juwaybir is not to be busied with.”

And An-Nasâ’î (d. 303 H.) said: “He is *Matrûk* (Abandoned) when it comes to *Ḥadîth*.”

⁶ “*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta’dîl*”, by Ibn Abî Ḥâtim, Vol. 2/272, “*Adh-Dhu’afâ’ Wal-Matrûkîn*”, by An-Nasâ’î, Vol. 2/238, “*Al-Mughnî Fîdh-Dhu’afâ’*”, Vol. 2/496 and “*Mîzân al-’itidâl Fî Naqd ar-Rijâl*”, both by Ath-Thahabî, Vol. 5/374 and elsewhere.

⁷ “*Al-’Ilal Wa Ma’rifat ar-Rijâl Li-Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal*”, by ‘Abdullâh Ibn Aḥmad, Vol. 2/152, “*At-Târikh al-Kabîr*”, Vol. 2/257 and “*Adh-Dhu’afâ’ aṣ-Ṣaghîr*”, 58, both by Al-Bukhârî, “*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta’dîl*”, by Ibn Abî Ḥâtim, Vol. 2/541, “*Al-Kâmil Fî Dhu’afâ’ ar-Rijâl*”, by Ibn ‘Adî, Vol. 2/121, “*Târikh ad-Dawrî*” Vol. 2/388, “*Adh-Dhu’afâ’*” by Al-’Uqaylî, Vol. 2/223-224 and elsewhere.

And Ibn 'Adî (d. 365 H.) said: "The weakness in his *Aḥādīth* is obvious."

And Abû Aḥmad *al-Ḥâkim* (d. 378 H.) said: "He is gone when it comes to *Ḥadīth*."

He was also declared weak by:

- Wakî' Ibn al-Jarrâḥ (d. 197 H.)
- Yaḥyâ Ibn Sa'îd al-Qaṭṭân (d. 198 H.)
- 'Alî Ibn al-Madîni (d. 234 H.)
- Al-Bukhârî (d. 256 H.)

b) The *Marfû'* Ḥadīth of Jâbir Ibn 'Abdillâh collected by Aḥmad ⁸

He said:

حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ سَابِقٍ حَدَّثَنَا إِبْرَاهِيمُ بْنُ طَهْمَانَ عَنْ أَبِي الزُّبَيْرِ عَنْ جَابِرِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ أَنَّهُ قَالَ: قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ:

Muḥammad Ibn Sâbiq told us: Ibrâhîm Ibn Ṭahmân told us: On the authority of Abuz-Zubayr: On the authority of Jâbir Ibn 'Abdillâh that he said: The Messenger of Allâh, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said:

"وَلَهُ حِمَارٌ يَرْكَبُهُ عَرُضُ مَا بَيْنَ أُذُنَيْهِ أَرْبَعُونَ ذِرَاعًا."

"And he has a donkey he will ride; the width between its ears is forty cubits."

It contains three defects:

1. It contains Muḥammad Ibn Sâbiq, who is weak. ⁹

Some accepted him:

Al-'Ijlî (d. 261 H.) said: "He is trustworthy."

And Muḥammad Ibn Ṣâliḥ Kaylajah (d. 271 H.) said: "He was a good person. There is no problem with him."

⁸ "Al-Musnad", (#14,954)

⁹ "Târîkh ath-Thuqât", by Al-'jli, pg. 404, "Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta'dîl", by Ibn Abî Ḥatîm, "Târîkh Baghdâd", by Al-Khatîb al-Baghdâdî, Vol. 5/340, "Ath-Thuqât", by Ibn Ḥibbân, Vol. 9/61, "Tah'thîb al-Kamâl Fî Asmâ' ar-Rijâl", by Al-Mizzî, Vol. 25/236-237, "Tah'thîb at-Tah'thîb", by Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalânî, Vol. 3/567, "Shatharât ath-Thahab Fî Akhbâri Man Thahab", by Ibn al-'Imâd, Vol. 3/78

And An-Nasâ'î (d. 303 H.) said: "There is no problem with him."

However, Yaḥyâ Ibn Ma'în (d. 233 H.) said: "He is *Dha'îf*."

And Ya'qûb Ibn Shaybah (d. 262 H.) said: "He was a truthful, trustworthy *Shaykh*, yet he was not one who is labelled as being accurate with *Ḥadîth*."

And Abû Ḥatîm ar-Râzî (d. 277 H.) said: "His *Ḥadîth* are to be written and they are not to be used as evidence."

I asked *Shaykh* Mâhir Ibn Yâsîn al-Faḥl about these statements and he said: "He is *Dha'îf* (Weak)."

And I asked *Shaykh* Al-Ḥârith Ibn 'Alî al-Ḥasanî about this, and he said: "The correct opinion is that he is *Dha'îf* (Weak)."

And I asked *Shaykh* Ibrâhîm Ibn 'Abdillâh al-Lâḥim about this, and he said: "He is as Ya'qûb said; he is trustworthy in and of himself, yet there is weakness in his memory. He is usable for *Mutâba'ât*."

And this appears to be the most just and well-rounded way of understanding the words of the early *Imâms*.

This is particularly true when we see that the only one who declared him "*Thiqah* (Trustworthy)" was Al-'Ijlî. And Al-'Ijlî is known for being lax when it comes to declaring narrators trustworthy.¹⁰ Likewise, the other two who accepted him (Muḥammad Ibn Ṣâliḥ Kaylajah and An-Nasâ'î) merely said there was no problem with him. And this is not a strong declaration of trustworthiness.

2. The *Tafarrud* (Individual Narration) of Muḥammad Ibn Sâbiq from Ibrâhîm Ibn Ṭahmân. This is because, as discussed, Muḥammad Ibn Sâbiq has a weak memory. And Ibrâhîm Ibn Ṭahmân has dozens of people who narrated from him, including major *Imâms* such as 'Abdur-Raḥmân Ibn Mahdî, Wakî' Ibn al-Jarrâḥ, 'Abdullâh Ibn al-Mubârak, 'Abdur-Razzâq aṣ-Ṣan'ânî, Sufyân Ibn 'Uyaynah and others. And I asked *Shaykh* Ibrâhîm Ibn 'Abdillâh al-Lâḥim: "And his *Tafarrud* (Individual Narration) from Ibrâhîm Ibn Ṭahmân is an additional defect?" He said: "Yes."

3. The narration of Abuz-Zubayr from Jâbir Ibn 'Abdillâh. Abuz-Zubayr is known for *Tadlîs*. And the correct opinion when it comes to his narrations from Jâbir Ibn 'Abdillâh is that when he says "*Ḥaddathanî Jâbir* (Jâbir told me)", it is accepted that he heard it from Jâbir. However, if he says "*An Jâbir* (From Jâbir)", then there is an unnamed narrator between the two. This is the case

¹⁰ "Al-'Awâṣim Min al-Qawâṣim", by Ibn al-Wazîr al-Yamânî, Vol. 7/27, "Al-Anwâr al-Kâshifah Limâ Fî Kitâb Adhwâ' 'Alas-Sunnah Min az-Zalali Wat-Tadhîlî Wal-Mujâzafah", by Al-Mu'allimî al-Yamânî, pg. 68 and "Silsilat al-Aḥâdîth aṣ-Ṣaḥîḥah", by Al-Albânî, Vol. 7/633

unless the chain of narration is Al-Layth from Abuz-Zubayr from Jâbir Ibn ‘Abdillâh, as Al-Layth would verify from Abuz-Zubayr whether or not he heard each narration from Jâbir. ¹¹

c) The Marfû’ *Ḥadîth* of Abû Hurayrah collected by Al-Bukhârî ¹² and Al-Ḥasan Ibn Rashîq ¹³

Al-Bukhârî said:

عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَنْ أَبِي هُرَيْرَةَ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ:

On the authority of his father: On the authority of Abû Hurayrah: On the authority of the Prophet, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, who said:

"يَخْرُجُ الدَّجَالُ عَلَى حِمَارٍ أَقْمَرِ مَا بَيْنَ أُذُنَيْهِ سَبْعُونَ بَاعًا."

"The Dajjâl will emerge on a bright white donkey; (the distance of) that which is between his ears is seventy Bâ'."

قَالَ لِي إِسْمَاعِيلُ عَنْ أَخِيهِ عَنْ سُلَيْمَانَ عَنْ مُحَمَّدٍ

Ismâ’il said it to me: On the authority of his brother: On the authority of Sulaymân: On the authority of Muḥammad.

And a Bâ’ which was mentioned in this narration of Al-Bukhârî is the distance of outstretched arms.

This chain of narration from Al-Bukhârî is:

Ismâ’il Ibn Abî ‘Uways: On the authority of ‘Abdul-Ḥamîd Ibn Abî ‘Uways: On the authority of Sulaymân Ibn Bilâl: On the authority of Muḥammad Ibn ‘Uqbah Ibn Abî ‘Attâb: On the authority of ‘Uqbah Ibn Abî ‘Attâb.

It contains three defects:

1. It contains Ismâ’il Ibn Abî ‘Uways whose narrations are rejected, other than those in “*Ṣaḥîḥ al-Bukhârî*” ¹⁴

¹¹ “*Mîzân al-I’tidâl Fî Naqd ar-Rijâl*”, by Ath-Thahabî, Vol. 1/460, “*Al-Muḥallâ*”, by Ibn Ḥazm, Vol. 2/309-310, “*Al-Iḥkâm Fî Uṣûl al-Aḥkâm*”, by Ibn Ḥazm, Vol. 6/135, “*Ṭabaqât al-Mudallisîn*”, by Ibn Ḥajar, 45, “*Jâmi’ at-Taḥṣîl Fî Aḥkâm al-Marâsîl*”, by Al-‘Alâ’î, 110, “*Bayân al-Wahmî Wal-Îḥâm al-Wâq’ayni Fî Kitâb al-Aḥkâm*”, by Ibn Qaṭṭân al-Fâsî, Vol. 2/55 and elsewhere.

¹² “*At-Târikh al-Kabîr*”, Vol. 1/508

¹³ “*Al-Muntaqâ Min al-Amâl*”, Vol. 2/42.

¹⁴ “*Al-Kâmil Fî Dhu’afâ’ ar-Rijâl*”, by Ibn ‘Adî, Vol. 1/323, “*Hadî as-Sâri’*”, Vol. 1/482, “*Taqrîb at-Taḥthîb*”, pg. 44, both by Ibn Ḥajar, “*Mîzân al-I’tidâl*”, by Ath-Thahabî, Vol. 1/379, “*Târikh Baghdâd*”, by Al-Khaṭîb al-Baghdâdî, Vol. 2/19, “*Taḥthîb al-Kamâl*”, by Al-Mizzî, Vol. 15/166-171, “*Târikh ad-Dawrî ‘An Ibn Ma’in*”, by Ad-Dawrî, Vol. 2/317-318, “*At-Târikh al-Kabîr*”, by Al-Bukhârî, Vol. 5/127, “*Su’âlât ad-Dârimî Li-Yahyâ Ibn Ma’in*”, by Ad-Dârimî, pg. 694-695

Yahyâ Ibn Ma'în (d. 233 H.) and Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241 H.) said: "There is no problem with him."

And Abû Ḥâtim ar-Râzî (d. 277 H.) said: "He was solid in and of himself."

And he said: "He was from the trustworthy narrators."

However, Yahyâ Ibn Ma'în (d. 233 H.) also said: "He is *Ṣadûq* (truthful) but his mind was weak, and he was not that (strong)."

And he said: "Abû 'Uways and his son are both *Dha'îf* (weak)."

And he said: "Ibn Abî 'Uways and his father used to steal *Aḥâdîth*."

And he said: "He was one who would mix things up, and a liar. He is nothing."

And Abû Ḥâtim ar-Râzî (d. 277 H.) said: "He is truthful, yet absentminded."

And An-Nasâ'î (d. 303 H.) said: "He is *Dha'îf*."

And he said: "He is not trustworthy."

And Ibn 'Adî (d. 365 H.) said: "He narrated from *Gharîb* (Individual) *Aḥâdîth* which no one else did."

And Ad-Dâraquṭnî (d. 385 H.) said: "I do not choose him for anything authentic."

And Abul-Qâsim al-Lâlakâ'î (d. 418 H.) said: "Their (i.e. the *Imâms* of *Ḥadîth*) words are to be understood as him being *Dha'îf* (Weak)."

And Ibn Ḥajar (d. 852H.) said: "He was *Ṣadûq* (truthful), but made mistakes in *Aḥâdîth* (when he narrated) from his memory."

And he said: "Ismâ'îl took out his original manuscripts for him (i.e. Al-Bukhârî). And he gave him permission to select from them and to tell him what he would narrate from him, so that he may narrate them himself and disregard the rest. And this gives the impression that whatever Al-Bukhârî collected from him is from his authentic *Aḥâdîth*, because he wrote them from his original manuscripts. And based upon this, nothing (of his) other than what is in the "*Ṣaḥîḥ*" is to be used as proof, due to what An-Nasâ'î and others criticized him with, unless someone else also narrates what he does, at which point it can be taken into consideration."

With this, we see that all of his narrations are weak, other than those collected in "*Ṣaḥîḥ al-Bukhârî*".

2. It contains Muḥammad Ibn ‘Uqbah Ibn Abî ‘Attâb who is *Majhûl* (Unknown).¹⁵

No one mentioned any criticism or declaration of trustworthiness about him. Likewise, no one narrated from him other than Sulaymân Ibn Bilâl.

3. It contains ‘Uqbah Ibn Abî ‘Attâb who is *Majhûl* (Unknown).¹⁶

No one mentioned any criticism or declaration of trustworthiness about him. Likewise, no one narrated from him other than his son, Muḥammad Ibn ‘Uqbah Ibn Abî ‘Attâb.

And, as mentioned earlier, it was also narrated by Al-Ḥasan Ibn Rashîq. He said:

حَدَّثَنَا عَلِيُّ بْنُ سَعِيدٍ بْنُ بَشِيرٍ ثَنَا عَبْدُ الْعَزِيزِ بْنُ يَحْيَى ثَنَا سُلَيْمَانُ بْنُ بِلَالٍ عَنْ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ عُقْبَةَ عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَنْ أَبِي هُرَيْرَةَ قَالَ: قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ:

‘Alî Ibn Sa’îd Ibn Bashîr told us: ‘Abdul-‘Azîz Ibn Yahyâ told us: Sulaymân Ibn Bilâl told us: On the authority of Muḥammad Ibn ‘Uqbah: On the authority of his father: On the authority of Abû Hurayrah who said: The Messenger of Allâh Prophet, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said:

"يَخْرُجُ الدَّجَالُ عَلَى حِمَارٍ أَقْمَرِ مَا بَيْنَ أُذُنَيْهِ سَبْعُونَ بَاعًا مَعَهُ سَبْعُونَ أَلْفَ يَهُودِيٍّ عَلَيْهِمُ الطَّيَالِسَةُ الْخَضِرُ..."

"The Dajjâl will emerge on a bright white donkey; (the distance of) that which is between his ears is seventy Bâ'. With him will be seventy thousand Jews, upon whom are large green pieces of cloth..."

This contains three defects as well.

1. It contains ‘Abdul-‘Azîz Ibn Yahyâ al-Madanî, who is liar.¹⁷

Al-Bukhârî (d. 256 H.) said: "He is not from the People of *Ḥadîth*. He used to fabricate *Ḥadîth*."

And Abû Zur’ah ar-Râzî (d. 264 H.) said: "He isn't to be believed. I mentioned him to Ibrâhîm Ibn al-Munthir¹⁸ and he declared him to be a liar."

And Abû Ḥâtim ar-Râzî (d. 277 H.) said: "He is weak."

¹⁵ "At-Târîkh al-Kabîr", by Al-Bukhârî, Vol. 1/177, "Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta'dîl", by Ibn Abî Ḥâtim, Vol. 8/35 and "Ath-Thuqât", by Ibn Hibbân, Vol. 7/400,

¹⁶ "At-Târîkh al-Kabîr", by Al-Bukhârî, Vol. 6/436, "Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta'dîl", by Ibn Abî Ḥâtim, Vol. 3/315 and "Ath-Thuqât", by Ibn Hibbân, Vol. 5/228,

¹⁷ "Adh-Dhu'afâ' al-Kabîr", by Al-'Uqaylî, 3/19, "Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta'dîl", by Ibn Abî Ḥâtim, Vol. 5/400, "Al-Kâmil Fî Dhu'afâ' ar-Rijâl", by Ibn 'Adî, Vol. 5/2016, "Mîzân al-I'tidâl Fî Naqd ar-Rijâl", Vol. 2/636, "Al-Mughnî Fî Dh-Dhu'afâ'", Vol. 2/400 and "Dîwân adh-Dhu'afâ' Wal-Matrûkîn", 196, all by Ath-Thahabî, "Tahthîb at-Tahthîb", Vol. 6/363 and "Taqrîb at-Tahthîb", Vol. 1/513 both by Ibn Ḥajar

¹⁸ (d. 236 H.)

And Abû Ja'far al-'Uqaylî (d. 322 H.) said: "He narrated *Bâtîl* (False) narrations from trustworthy narrators. And he claims *Ḥadîth* from Mâlik and others which none of the earlier narrators knew."

2. It contains Muḥammad Ibn 'Uqbah Ibn Abî 'Attâb who is *Majhûl* (Unknown).

He was discussed previously.

3. It contains 'Uqbah Ibn Abî 'Attâb who is *Majhûl* (Unknown) as well.

He was also discussed previously.

**d) The *Marfû'* Ḥadîth of 'Abdullâh Ibn Mas'ûd
collected by Abû Nu'aym ¹⁹**

Abû Nu'aym said:

حَدَّثَنَا أَبُو عُمَرَ عَنْ ابْنِ لَهْيَعَةَ عَنْ عَبْدِ الْوَهَّابِ بْنِ حُسَيْنٍ عَنْ مُحَمَّدِ بْنِ ثَابِتٍ عَنْ أَبِيهِ عَنِ الْحَارِثِ عَنْ
عَبْدِ اللَّهِ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَالَ:

Abû 'Umar told us: On the authority of Ibn Lahî'ah: On the authority of 'Abdul-Wahhâb Ibn Ḥusayn: On the authority of Muḥammad Ibn Thâbit: On the authority of his father: On the authority of Al-Ḥârith: On the authority of 'Abdullâh: On the authority of the Prophet, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, who said:

"بَيْنَ أُذُنَيْ حِمَارِ الدَّجَّالِ أَرْبَعُونَ ذِرَاعًا وَخَطْوَةُ حِمَارِهِ مَسِيرَةُ ثَلَاثَةِ أَيَّامٍ يَخُوضُ الْبَحْرَ عَلَى حِمَارِهِ
كَمَا يَخُوضُ أَحَدُكُمْ السَّاقِيَةَ عَلَى فَرَسِهِ..."

"Between the ears of the donkey of the Dajjâl is forty cubits. And one step of his donkey is the distance of three days. He will wade into the sea with his donkey the way one of you wades into a brooklet on his horse...."

This contains four defects:

1. It contains 'Abdullâh Ibn Lahî'ah, who is *Dha'îf* (Weak). ²⁰

Yahyâ Ibn Ma'în (d. 233 H.) said: "He is weak when it comes to *Ḥadîth*."

¹⁹ "Al-Fitan", Vol. 2/543

²⁰ "Târîkh Ibn Ma'în", by Ad-Dârimî, pg. 153; "Târîkh Ibn Ma'în", by Ad-Dawrî, Vol. 2/327; "Al-Jâmi'" by Al-Khaṭîb al-Baghdâdî, Vol. 2/193; "Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta'dîl", by Ibn Abî Ḥâtim, Vol. 4/147; "Al-Jâmi'" by At-Tirmithî, (#1630); "Adh-Dhu'afâ' Wal-Matrûkîn", by An-Nasâ'î, pg. 153; "As-Sunan", by Ad-Dâraquṭnî, Vol. 1/240-241 and 344; "At-Târîkh al-Kabîr", by Al-Bukhârî, Vol. 5/182; "Al-Kunâ Wal-Asmâ", by Muslim, pg. 68; "Al-Majrûḥîn Min al-Muḥaddithîn", by Ibn Ḥibbân, Vol. 1/506; "Aṭ-Ṭabaqât al-Kubrâ", by Ibn Sa'd, Vol. 7/358; "Târîkh Dimashq", by Ibn 'Asâkir, Vol. 32/141; "Ma'rifat ar-Rijâl Li-Ibn Ma'în", by Ibn Muḥriz, pg. 134; "Min Kalâm Yahyâ Ibn Ma'în Fir-Rijâl", by Ibn Ṭahmân, pg. 108

And he said: “His *Ḥadīth* are not used as proof.”

And he said: “In all of his *Ḥadīth*, he is nothing.”

And he said: “He is nothing, whether he changed or did not change.”

Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241 H.) said: “The *Ḥadīth* of Ibn Lahīʿah are not a proof.”

Muslim Ibn al-Ḥajjāj (d. 261 H.) said: “He was abandoned by Ibn Maḥdī, Yaḥyā Ibn Saʿīd and Wakīʿ.”

And he was weakened by Abū Zurʿah ar-Rāzī (d. 264 H.) and Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzī (d. 277 H.). They then said: “As for Ibn Lahīʿah, then his matter is confusing. His *Ḥadīth* are written to take into consideration.”

At-Tirmithī said (d. 279 H.): “Ibn Lahīʿah is weak according to the People of *Ḥadīth*. He was weakened by Yaḥyā Ibn Saʿīd al-Qaṭṭān and others due to his memory.”

An-Nasāʾī (d. 303 H.) said: “He is *Dhaʿīf* (Weak).”

Ibn Ḥibbān (d. 354 H.) mentioned him in his book “*Al-Majrūḥīn Min al-Muḥaddithīn*” and said: “It is obligatory to avoid the narrations of those who narrated from him early on before his books burned, due to the reports which have been narrated in *Tadlīs* form from weak narrators. And it is obligatory to abandon using the narrations of those who narrated from him after his books burned as proof, due to what they contain from that which is not from his *Ḥadīth*.”

And Abū Aḥmad *al-Ḥākim* (d. 378 H.) said: “He is gone when it comes to *Ḥadīth*.”

Ad-Dāraquṭnī (d. 385 H.) said: “He is *Dhaʿīf* when it comes to *Ḥadīth*.”

And he said: “His *Ḥadīth* is not to be used as proof.”

And he said: “He is not strong.”

And after mentioning that the narrations of those who narrated from him early on are better than those who narrated from him later on; Ibn Saʿd (d. 230 H.) said: “He was weak.” And ʿAmr Ibn ʿAlī al-Fallās (d. 249 H.) said: “And he is weak when it comes to *Ḥadīth*.”

2. It also contains ʿAbdul-Waḥḥāb Ibn Ḥusayn who is *Majhūl* (Unknown).²¹

Both Abū ʿAbdillāh *al-Ḥākim* and Ibn Ḥajar said: “He is *Majhūl* (Unknown).”

²¹ “*Al-Mustadrak ʿAlas-Ṣaḥīḥayn*”, by *Al-Ḥākim*, Vol. 4/522, “*Lisān al-Mizān*”, by Ibn Ḥajar, Vol. 4/87

3. It also contains Muḥammad Ibn Thâbit Ibn Aslam, who is weak. ²²

‘Affân Ibn Muslim aṣ-Ṣaffâr (d. 220 H.) said: “He is a truthful man in and of himself, however, he is weak with regards to *Ḥadīth*.”

And Yahyâ Ibn Ma‘în (d. 233 H.) said: “He is nothing.”

And he, Abû Ḥâtim ar-Râzî (d. 277 H.) and Ya‘qûb Ibn Sufyân al-Fasawî (d. 277 H.) all said: “He is not strong.”

And Abû Zur‘ah ar-Râzî (d. 264 H.) said: “He is *Layyin* (Lacking in strength).”

And Abû Dâwûd (d. 275 H.) and An-Nasâ‘î (d. 303 H.) and Ad-Dâraquṭnî (d. 385 H.) all said: “He is *Dha’îf* (Weak).”

And Abû Ḥâtim ar-Râzî (d. 277 H.) also said: “He is *Munkar* when it comes to *Ḥadīth*; his *Ḥadīth* are to be written but not to be used as proof.”

And Ya‘qûb Ibn Sufyân al-Fasawî (d. 277 H.) also said: “He is *Dha’îf* (Weak).”

And Ibn Ḥibbân (d. 354 H.) said: “He narrates from his father what is not from his *Ḥadīth*, as though it is different Thâbit. It is not allowed to use him as proof nor to narrate from him, despite his small amount (of *Ḥadīth*).”

And Abul-Fat’h al-Azdî (d. 374 H.) said: “He is *Sâqit* (Disreputable/Degraded).”

4. And it also contains Al-Ḥârith Ibn ‘Abdillâh al-A’war. The words of the Scholars of *Ḥadīth* vary between him being declared weak to being declared a liar, with a few accepting him. ²³

Ash-Sha’bî (d. 100 H.) said: “I testify that he is one of the liars.”

²² “*Târîkh ad-Dawrî ‘An Yahyâ Ibn Ma‘în*”, by Ad-Dawrî, Vol. 2/507, “*Su’âlât al-Âjurî Li-Abî Dâwûd*”, by Abû ‘Ubayd Al-Âjurî, Vol. 3/242, “*Adh-Dhu’afâ’ Wal-Matrûkîn*”, by An-Nasâ‘î, pg. 217, “*Al-Majrûhîn Min al-Muḥaddithîn*”, by Ibn Ḥibbân, Vol. 2/252, “*Al-Kâmil Fî Dhu’afâ’ ar-Rijâl*”, by Ibn ‘Adî, Vol. 8/136-137, “*Tahthîb al-Kamâl*”, Vol. “*Tahthîb at-Tahthîb*”, Vol. 9/72 and “*Mîzân al-Itidâl*”, Vol. 3/495, “*Al-Ma’rifah Wat-Târîkh*”, by Ya‘qûb Ibn Sufyân al-Fasawî, Vol. 2/664, “*At-Târîkh al-Kabîr*”, by Al-Bukhârî, Vol. 1/50, “*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta’dîl*”, by Ibn Abî Ḥâtim, Vol. 7/217, “*Taqrîb at-Tahthîb*”, by Ibn Ḥajar, pg. 830

²³ “*Kitâb at-Ṭabaqât al-Kabîr*” by Ibn Sa’d, Vol. 6/186; “*Târîkh ad-Dawrî ‘An Ibn Ma‘în*”, Vol. 3/268, 361 and 495; “*Târîkh ad-Dârimî ‘An Ibn Ma‘în*”, by Ad-Dârimî, 90; “*Al-‘Ilal Wa Ma’rifat ar-Rijâl*”, by Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal, Vol. 1/173 and 2/168; “*At-Târîkh aṣ-Ṣaghîr*”, by Al-Bukhârî, Vol. 1/149 and 156; “*Aḥwâl ar-Rijâl*”, by Al-Jawzajânî, Vol. 41-43 and 46; “*Muqaddimat Ṣaḥîḥ Muslim*”, by Muslim Ibn al-Ḥajjâj, Vol. 1/19; “*Su’âlât al-Bartha’î Li-Abî Zur‘ah*”, by Al-Bartha’î, Vol. 2/587; “*Adh-Dhu’afâ’ al-Kabîr*”, by Al-‘Uqaylî, Vol. 1/209; “*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta’dîl*”, by Ibn Abî Ḥâtim, Vol. 2/78-79; “*Al-Majrûhîn Min al-Muḥaddithîn*”, by Ibn Ḥibbân, Vol. 1/222, “*Al-Jâmi’*” by At-Tirmithî, (#812), “*Al-Kâmil Fî Dhu’afâ’ ar-Rijâl*”, by Ibn ‘Adî, Vol. 2/605; “*Al-‘Ilal*”, by Ad-Dâraquṭnî, Vol. 4/21 and elsewhere.

And he said: "By Allâh, he was a liar."

And Abû Is'ḥâq as-Sabî'î (d. 127 H.) said: "He is a *Kathûb* (liar)."

And Zuhayr Ibn Mu'âwiyah al-Ju'fî (d. 173 H.), 'Alî Ibn al-Maḍînî (d. 234 H.) and Zuhayr Ibn Ḥarb (d. 234 H.) all said: "He is a *Kathûb* (Consistent liar)."

And Abû Zur'ah ar-Râzî (d. 264 H.) said: "His *Ḥadîth* are not to be used as proof."

And Abû Ḥâtim ar-Râzî (d. 277 H.) said: "He is not strong and not from those whose *Ḥadîth* are to be used as proof."

And At-Tirmithî (d. 279 H.) said: "There is some discussion about him. Some of the People of Knowledge weakened him."

And An-Nasâ'î (d. 303 H.) said: "He is not strong."

And Ibn Ḥibbân (d. 354 H.) said: "He was an extremist in *Tashayyu'* (partisanship to 'Alî, رضي الله عنه) *Wâhî* (Feeble) in *Ḥadîth*."

And Ibn 'Adî (d. 365 H.) said: "All of what he narrates is incorrect."

And Al-Bayhaqî (d. 458 H.) said: "He is not to be used as proof."

e) The *Mawqûf Ḥadîth* of 'Abdullâh Ibn Mas'ûd collected by Ibn Abî Shaybah ²⁴

He said:

حَدَّثَنَا عَبْدُ الرَّزَّاقِ عَنْ سُفْيَانَ عَنِ الْأَعْمَشِ عَنْ عَبْدِ الْمَلِكِ بْنِ مَيْسَرَةَ الزَّرَّادِ عَنْ حَوْطِ الْعَبْدِيِّ عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ قَالَ:

'Abdur-Razzâq told us: On the authority of Sufyân: On the authority of Al-A'mash: On the authority of 'Abdul-Malik Ibn Maysarah az-Zarrâd: On the authority of Ḥawṭ al-'Abdî: On the authority of 'Abdullâh who said:

"يَسْتَظِلُّ فِي ظِلِّ أُذُنِ حِمَارِ الدَّجَالِ سَبْعُونَ أَلْفًا."

"Seventy thousand will seek shade under the ears of the donkey of the *Dajjâl*."

The chain of this *Ḥadîth* contains Ḥawṭ al-'Abdî, who is unknown. Ibn Kathîr said: "Our *Shaykh*, Al-Ḥâfith Ath-Thahabî said: 'Ḥawṭ is unknown and the narration is *Munkar*.'"

²⁴ Narrated by Ibn Abî Shaybah in "*Al-Muṣannaḡ*", Vol/7/495

The only declaration of him being trustworthy is Ibn Hibbân mentioning him in “*Ath-Thuqât*”. And some mention that Yahyâ Ibn Ma’în declared him *Thiqah*.

However, this is insufficient, as it is well known that in this book, Ibn Hibbân mentions anyone about whom he knew no criticism. Furthermore, it is unclear which Hawṭ both were speaking about, as there is an extremely long dispute about who this Hawṭ is, and whether or not he is the same as some others with similar names. As for Yahyâ Ibn Ma’în in particular, we can say he was speaking about a different Hawṭ al-‘Abdî. This is evident because the one he was discussing is Hawṭ Ibn Yazîd, also known as Hawṭ Ibn Râfi’, while the name of the father of this Hawṭ al-‘Abdî in this chain is not known. Likewise, the Hawṭ al-‘Abdî in this chain narrated from ‘Abdullâh Ibn Mas’ûd (d. 32 H.) and Zayd Ibn Arqam (d. 66 H. or 68 H.). While the one discussed by Yahyâ Ibn Ma’în narrated from Tamîm Ibn Salamah (d. 100 H.). Knowing this, some have said that this proves they are two different narrators, because there is such a long span of time between the death of ‘Abdullâh Ibn Mas’ûd and Tamîm Ibn Salamah.²⁵

Likewise, there were over a hundred people who narrated from ‘Abdullâh Ibn Mas’ûd; some from the *Saḥâbah* and some from the *Tâbi’în*. Despite this, we only have this one person narrating this from him.

Lastly, out of all the *Aḥādīth* collected about the *Dajjâl*, including those in both “*Ṣaḥîḥ al-Bukhârî*” and “*Ṣaḥîḥ Muslim*” or in one of the two, and all of those narrated with clearly authentic chains, there is no mention of this detail. And out of all of the *Aḥādīth* narrated from the words of the Prophet, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, himself, we have no mention of this, and only have it coming from the alleged words of a Companion.

2. What is confirmed on the topic?

‘Abdullâh Ibn Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal said:

حَدَّثَنِي أَبِي: نَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ جَعْفَرٍ: نَا شُعْبَةُ: عَنْ قَتَادَةَ قَالَ: سَمِعْتُ أَبَا الطُّفَيْلِ ح قَالَ أَبِي وَحَجَّاجٌ: حَدَّثَنَا شُعْبَةُ: عَنْ قَتَادَةَ سَمِعْتُ أَبَا الطُّفَيْلِ قَالَ:

My father told me: Muḥammad Ibn Ja’far informed us: Shu’bah informed us: on the authority of Qatâdah who said: I heard Abuṭ-Ṭufayl...Likewise: My father and Ḥajjâj said: Shu’bah told us: On the authority of Qatâdah: I heard Abuṭ-Ṭufayl say:

مَرَرْتُ عَلَى حُذَيْفَةَ بْنِ أَسِيدٍ فَقُلْتُ: مَا يُفْعِدُكَ وَقَدْ خَرَجَ الدَّجَالُ؟ قَالَ: "أَقْعُدُ." فَذَكَرَ الْحَدِيثَ. قَالَ: "وَفِيهِ ثَلَاثُ عَلَامَاتٍ أَعْوَرُ وَرَبُّكُمْ لَيْسَ بِأَعْوَرَ وَلَا يُسَخَّرُ لَهُ مِنَ الدَّوَابِّ إِلَّا حِمَارٌ رَجَسٌ عَلَى رِجْسٍ..."

²⁵ “*At-Târîkh al-Kabîr*”, by Al-Bukhârî, Vol. 2/91, “*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta’dîl*” by Ibn Abî Ḥatîm, Vol. 3/288, “*Ath-Thuqât*”, by Ibn Hibbân, Vol. 4/181, “*Al-Mu’talif Wal-Mukhtalif*”, by Ad-Dâraqutnî, Vol. 2/861, “*Taḥthîb Mustamirr al-Awhâm*”, by Ibn Mâkûlâ, Vol. 1/101, “*Al-Muwadhiḥ Li-Awhâm al-Jam’i Wat-Tafrîq*”, by Al-Khatîb al-Baghdâdî, Vol. 1/106-109, “*Al-Fitan Wal-Malâḥim*”, by Ibn Kathîr, Vol. 1/112

I passed by Ḥuthayfah Ibn Asîd, so I said to him: ‘What makes you sit, even though the *Dajjâl* has emerged?’ He said: ‘I sit.’ Then he mentioned the *Ḥadîth*. He said: “And he has three signs: he is one-eyed, and your Lord is not one-eyed. And no creature will be subjugated for him (to ride upon) other than a donkey: an abomination on top of an abomination...”²⁶

This is an authentic chain of narration.

There are two possible reasons one may reject this narration:

Firstly: Some have said that the only *Ṣaḥâbi* from whom Qatâdah heard was Anas Ibn Mâlik. However, the correct opinion is that Qatâdah also heard from Abuṭ-Ṭufayl. This was confirmed by ‘Alî Ibn al-Madîni (d. 234 H),²⁷ Al-Bukhârî (d. 256 H.),²⁸ At-Tirmithî (d. 279 H),²⁹ Ibn Abî Ḥâtim (d. 327 H.)³⁰ and others.

Secondly: Qatâdah was known for *Tadlîs*, and in some of the narrations of this *Ḥadîth*, he narrated it from Abuṭ-Ṭufayl in ‘*An’*anah form.

Abû ‘Abdillâh *al-Ḥâkim* said:

أَخْبَرَنَا أَبُو عَبْدِ اللَّهِ مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ يَعْقُوبَ الْحَافِظُ رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى ثَنَا يَحْيَى بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ يَحْيَى ثَنَا مُسَدَّدُ ثَنَا مُعَاذُ بْنُ هِشَامٍ حَدَّثَنِي أَبِي عَنْ قَتَادَةَ عَنْ أَبِي الطُّفَيْلِ...

Abû ‘Abdillâh Muḥammad Ibn Ya’qûb *al-Ḥâfith*, رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى, informed us: Yahyâ Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Yahyâ told us: Musaddad told us: Mu’âth Ibn Hishâm told us: My father told me: On the authority of ‘(An) Qatâdah: On the authority of ‘(An) Abuṭ-Ṭufayl...”³¹

However, this narration is not at the same level of authenticity as the one in which Qatâdah stated he heard from Abuṭ-Ṭufayl. This is because the *Aḥâdîth* of Mu’âth Ibn Hishâm are “*Ḥasan*” and not at the height of authenticity.³²

Yahyâ Ibn Ma’în said: “He is *Thiqah* (Trustworthy).”

And he said: “He is *Ṣadûq* (truthful), but not a proof.”

And he said: “He is not very strong.”

²⁶ Narrated by ‘Abdullâh Ibn Aḥmad in “*As-Sunnah*”, (#899)

²⁷ “*Jâmi’ at-Taḥṣîl*” by Al-‘Alâ’î, pg. 225,

²⁸ “*At-Târikh al-Kabîr*” by Al-Bukhârî, Vol. 7/186

²⁹ “*Al-Jâmi’*”, by At-Tirmithî, (#2,941)

³⁰ “*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta’dîl*”, by Ibn Abî Ḥâtim, Vol. 7/133

³¹ “*Al-Mustadrak ‘Alaṣ-Ṣaḥîḥayn*”, by Abû ‘Abdillâh *al-Ḥâkim*, (#8,657)

³² “*Târikh ad-Dawrî ‘An Ibn Ma’în*”, by Ad-Dawrî, Vol. 2/572, “*At-Târikh al-Kabîr*”, by Al-Bukhârî, Vol. 7/366, “*Sû’âlât Abî ‘Ubayd al-Âjurrî Abâ Dâwûd as-Sijastânî*”, by Abû ‘Ubayd al-Âjurrî, Vol. 3/263, “*Ath-Thuqât*”, by Ibn Ḥibbân, Vol. 9/176-177, “*Thuqât Ibn Shâhin*”, (1347), “*Lisân al-Mîzân*”, Vol. 7/391, and “*Hadî as-Sâri*”, pg. 444, both by Ibn Ḥajar and elsewhere.

And he said: “He wasn’t *Thiqah*. The people of *Ḥadīth* only had a desire for him due to the chain of narration.”

And Abû Dâwûd was asked by Abû ‘Ubayd al-Âjurrî: “Mu’âth Ibn Hishâm is proof according to you?” He said: “I hate to say anything. Yaḥyâ was not pleased with him.” Abû ‘Ubayd said: “I do not know who he meant: Yaḥyâ al-Qaṭṭân or Yaḥyâ Ibn Ma’în. And I think it is Yaḥyâ al-Qaṭṭân.

And Ibn ‘Adî said: “He has *Ṣâliḥ* (good) *Aḥādīth* from other than his father. And he possibly made mistake after mistake in something. And I hope he is truthful.”

And Ibn Ḥibbân mentioned him in “*Ath-Thuqât*” and said: “He was from amongst those who were accurate.”

And Ibn Qâni’ al-Baghdâdî (d. 351 H.) said: “*Thiqah Ma’mûn*”

And Ibn Shâhîn mentioned him in “*Ath-Thuqât*”.

And Ibn Ḥajar summed up his status well when he said: “He was truthful and perhaps made errors.”

So, this narration does not compare in authenticity to the narration of ‘Abdullâh Ibn Aḥmad. ‘Abdullâh’s narration has two people between him and Qatâdah; both his father (Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal) and Ḥajjâj Ibn Yûsuf Ibn Ḥajjâj from Shu’bah Ibn al-Ḥajjâj, all three of whom are amongst the greatest *Imâms* of *Ḥadīth*. Plus, the other narration he mentioned from his father (Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal), from Muḥammad Ibn Ja’far al-Warkânî from Shu’bah. On the other hand, the narration of *Al-Ḥâkim* contains five people between him and Qatâdah, one of whose *Ḥadīth* are not at the height of authenticity, but rather are “*Ḥasan*”.

Also, ‘Abdur-Razzâq said:

عَنْ مَعْمَرٍ عَنْ قَتَادَةَ قَالَ: نَادَى مُنَادٍ بِالْكُوفَةِ: الدَّجَالُ قَدْ خَرَجَ فَجَاءَ رَجُلٌ إِلَى حُذَيْفَةَ بْنِ أَسِيدٍ...

On the authority of Ma’mar: On the authority of Qatâdah who said: “A caller called out in Al-Kûfah: ‘The *Dajjâl* has emerged.’ So, a man came to Ḥuthayfah Ibn Asîd...”³³

However, this does not compare to the first narration in which Qatâdah stated he heard from Abuṭ-Ṭufayl. This is because the narrations of Ma’mar from Qatâdah are weak.³⁴

Yaḥyâ Ibn Ma’în said: “Ma’mar said: ‘I sat with Qatâdah when I was young, so I did not memorize his chains of narrations.’”

³³ “*Al-Muṣannaḥ*”, by ‘Abdur-Razzâq, (#20,827)

³⁴ “*Târîkh Ibn Abî Khaythamah*”, by Aḥmad Ibn Abî Khaythamah, Vol. 1/327, “*Al-Ma’rifah Wat-Târîkh*”, by Al-Fasawî, Vol. 2/281, “*Al-‘Ilal*”, by Ad-Dâraquṭnî, Vol. 4/40, “*Al-Jarḥ Wat-Ta’dîl*”, by Ibn Abî Ḥâtim, Vol. 8/256

And ‘Abdur-Razzâq said: “I heard Mâlik say, when I asked him about Ma’mar: ‘If not for.’ I asked: ‘If not for what?’ He said: ‘If not for his narration from Qatâdah.’”

And Ad-Dâraquṭnî said: “And Ma’mar had a bad memory regarding Qatâdah and Al-A’mash.”

As for the statement of Ma’mar: “I sat with Qatâdah when I was fourteen years old. And I did not hear a *Ḥadîth* from him except that it as though it is engraved in my heart.”

This is something he is saying about himself. And the judgment that comes from others after studying his narrations is given precedence over his statement about himself, as one cannot always accurately judge themselves. Furthermore, in the first statement, he stated he did not memorize the chains of narration, and that is what is being disputed here. While in the second statement, he stated there is no *Ḥadîth* he heard from Qatâdah except it is as though it is engraved in his heart, and we are not disputing the text of the *Ḥadîth*. So, *Al-Ḥamdulillâh*, it is clear that we cannot use this chain to disprove Qatâdah hearing this *Ḥadîth* from Abuṭ-Ṭufayl.

Do We Say for Certain This Will Happen?

As is clear from the previous narration, the mention of the *Dajjâl* riding a donkey is confirmed in the statement of the *Ṣaḥâbî* Ḥuthayfah Ibn Asîd.

However, it is also clear that he did not attribute it to the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Therefore, we cannot say definitively that this is something that will happen. This is further supported by the fact that other details mentioned in this *Ḥadîth* such as the *Dajjâl* being one-eyed, as well as having *kâfir* written between his eyes, have both come in the words of the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, himself, with chains that are at the height of authenticity. However, there is no mention of the donkey in any of those or other authentic *Ḥadîth* from the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, himself.

Some of these are:

On the authority of ‘Abdullâh Ibn ‘Umar, رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا, that the Messenger of Allâh, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, mentioned the *Dajjâl* to the people and said:

"إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَيْسَ بِأَعْوَرَ إِلَّا إِنَّ الْمَسِيحَ الدَّجَالَ أَعْوَرُ الْعَيْنِ الْيُمْنَى كَأَنَّ عَيْنَهُ عِنَبَةٌ طَافِيَةٌ."

"Indeed, Allâh is not one-eyed, but Al-Masîh ad-Dajjâl is one-eyed; blind or defective in his right eye, with his eye looking like a floating grape..."³⁵

And on the authority of Anas, رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, that the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said:

"مَا بُعِثَ نَبِيٌّ إِلَّا أَنْذَرَ أُمَّتَهُ الْأَعْوَرَ الْكَذَّابَ إِلَّا إِنَّهُ أَعْوَرُ وَإِنَّ رَبَّكُمْ لَيْسَ بِأَعْوَرَ وَإِنَّ بَيْنَ عَيْنَيْهِ مَكْتُوبٌ كَافِرٌ."

³⁵ Narrated by Al-Bukhârî (#3184)

"No Prophet was sent but he warned his people about the one-eyed liar. He is one-eyed, but your Lord is not one-eyed, and between his eyes will be written 'kâfir.'" ³⁶

According in another narration:

"وَمَكْتُوبٌ بَيْنَ عَيْنَيْهِ ك ف ر."

"And written between his eyes will be 'Kâf Fâ' Râ'." ³⁷

Therefore, we cannot even conform for certain that the *Dajjâl* will ride on a donkey. However, if one were to accept this narration based upon the fact that it is a *Ṣaḥâbî* saying something about the future, and therefore holds the same ruling as though the Prophet, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, said it himself, then we need to understand how this should be interpreted.

3. How are we to understand what is confirmed?

If we were to accept the concept that the *Dajjâl* will ride a donkey, how do we understand this? It is from the rules of the *Sharî'ah* that the Texts of the *Qur'ân* and *Sunnah* are to be understood based upon their apparent and literal meaning until there is Evidence to prove otherwise.

Imâm ash-Shâfi'î (d. 204 H.) said: "The *Qur'ân* is Arabic, as I described. And the rulings within it are based upon their apparent meaning and their generality. It is not for anyone to change what is apparent to a hidden meaning nor from general to specific, except with proof from the Book of Allâh. And if not with that, then with the *Sunnah* of the Messenger of Allâh, which would indicate that it is specific and not general, or hidden and not apparent; or by the consensus of all of the scholars who would not be unaware as a whole of something in the Book or something in the *Sunnah*. And the *Sunnah* is like this as well. And had it been permitted for *Ḥadîth* to be altered from their apparent meaning to a possible and plausible hidden meaning, then most *Ḥadîth* would hold numerous meanings, and no one who believed one of the meanings to be correct would not have any proof against someone who believed another meaning was correct. However, the truth regarding them is one, because they remain upon their apparent meaning and generality except when there is proof from the Messenger of Allâh or the opinion of all of the People of Knowledge that it is specific and not general or hidden and not apparent. This is the case if the meaning for which the apparent meaning was abandoned can validly be included in its actual definition." ³⁸

And *Imâm* Aṭ-Ṭabarî (d. 310 H.) said: "And it is not allowed to abandon what is understood outwardly for a hidden meaning for which there is no proof of its validity." ³⁹

³⁶ Narrated by Al-Bukhârî (#6,598)

³⁷ Narrated by Muslim (#5,219)

³⁸ "*Ikhtilâf al-Ḥadîth*", pg. 480

³⁹ "*Jâmi' al-Bayân 'An Ta'wîl Ây al-Qur'ân*", by Aṭ-Ṭabarî, Vol. 1/15

And *Al-Khaṭīb* al-Baghdādī (d. 463 H.) said: “It is obligatory for the *Aḥādīth* of the Messenger of Allāh to be understood in their generality and apparentness, unless an Evidence proves that something other than that was intended, at which point, they would be understood based on what the Evidence proves.”⁴⁰

And *Imām* Ibn al-Qayyim (d. 751 H.) said: “And from the duties toward words is that they are understood as reality until there is an agreement from the *Ummah* that what is meant by them is *Majāz* (Figurative). This is because there is no way to follow what has been Revealed to us from our Lord except through that. And the Words of Allāh are only held to the most well-known and most obvious of their meanings, as long as nothing which is obligatory to submit to (i.e. Revelation) prevents that. And had it been acceptable for anyone to claim that what is meant is figurative, none of the acts of worship would be affirmed.”⁴¹

And As-Subkī (d. 771 H.) said: “Understanding a phrase based upon what first comes to mind is most deserving. Therefore, based upon that, it is understood as reality until the figurative meaning is deemed to be what is meant, either through well-known use in the language or something else.”⁴²

And Az-Zarkashī (d. 794 H.) mentioned: “If a noun has a real and figurative meaning, and it comes in the address (of the *Sharī’ah*), it is understood based upon its real meaning.”⁴³

We see from these quotes that it is not allowed to claim that a phrase means something other than the literal meaning, unless we have explicit Evidence to prove so.

And the Arabic meaning of the word *Ḥimār* (donkey) is well known, and it is a four-legged, hooved, braying animal; whether domestic or wild. As for the figurative meanings of *Ḥimār*, then none of the meanings have anything to do with aeroplanes.

One may argue that this is because there were no aeroplanes until recently for this word to be used previously for this definition.

To this we say: Is it not within Allāh’s Ability to have the Prophet, صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, explain the vehicle of the *Dajjāl* in words that would be true for all ages? Could he not have said: “He will ride something you’ve never seen before?” or “He will fly through the sky on something similar to iron?” or “He will ride something resembling a bird?” etc.?

Furthermore, if we accept the single narration that mentions he rides on a donkey, then we see within it: “An abomination on top of an abomination.” The *Dajjāl* and the donkey were both

⁴⁰ “*Al-Faqīh Wal-Mutafaqqih*”, by *Al-Khaṭīb* al-Baghdādī, Vol. 1/222

⁴¹ “*Ḥāshiyat Ibn al-Qayyim ‘Alā Sunan Abī Dāwūd*”, Vol. 13/20.

⁴² “*Al-Ashbāh Wan-Nathā’ir*”, Vol. 1/274

⁴³ “*Al-Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ Fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh*”, Vol. 2/146

referred to as abominations. And if we look to the words of the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, himself, he called the donkey and/or its meat an abomination.

It has come on the authority of Anas Ibn Mâlik who said that the caller of the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, called out to the people:

"إِنَّ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ يَنْهَيَانِكُمْ عَنْ لُحُومِ الْحُمُرِ فَإِنَّهَا رِجْسٌ."

"Indeed, Allâh and His Messenger forbid you from the meat of domesticated donkeys, as it is an abomination." ⁴⁴

Therefore, we see the donkey of the *Dajjâl* referred to with the same adjective that was used to describe the actual donkeys and/or its meat which some people used to eat.

Based on these two points; 1) That words are to be understood literally and not figuratively unless there is evidence to prove otherwise and 2) That there is authentic Evidence which uses the same adjective to refer to real donkeys as was used by a *Ṣaḥâbî* to describe the donkey of the *Dajjâl*, it is obligatory to understand the donkey of the *Dajjâl* to be a real donkey.

Conclusion

It is evident from what has passed that there is nothing confirmed in the *Sharî'ah* regarding the description of the donkey of the *Dajjâl*. In fact, we have nothing confirmed from the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, that the *Dajjâl* will even ride a donkey.

All we have is one statement from one *Ṣaḥâbî* explaining that the *Dajjâl* will only ride a donkey. And if one accepts that this actually came from the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, it is obligatory upon him based upon the *Shar'î* Evidence (i.e. the *Ḥadîth* forbidding the meat of domesticated donkeys) and the linguistic evidence (i.e. understanding words literally not figuratively, until the opposite is proven), to say that the donkey of the *Dajjâl* is an actual living animal and the donkey that is known to people worldwide.

And through this discussion, it becomes clear that those who make the claim that the donkey of the *Dajjâl* is an aeroplane 1) Are ignorant of the Sciences of *Ḥadîth* 2) Are ignorant of the Arabic language 3) Lack basic logic.

And, as mentioned in the introduction; these claims are symptomatic of a greater illness, which is the misinterpretation of the Texts of the *Sharî'ah*. My advice to those who hear certain *Islâmic* speakers engage in this type of nonsense is to stop listening to them immediately and to listen to those who are soundly established in the Sciences of the *Sharî'ah*.

And Allâh Knows Best.

⁴⁴ Narrated by Al-Bukhâri (#4,198) and elsewhere, and Muslim (#1,942) and elsewhere.

Written by Abû Tâlût Haytham Âl Sayfaddîn